

Message

From: Carroll, Timothy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=7C1EF325560047F3A017036A7486B8F2-CARROLL, TI]
Sent: 12/27/2021 4:46:14 PM
To: Dunton, Cheryl [Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Media inquiry: PEER on EPA "hiding" VOC-exempt chemical's carcinogenicity
Attachments: Risks of existing chemicals in PMNs (002).pdf

Got it, just confirming we want to use these pieces, right?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Tim Carroll (he/him)
Deputy Press Secretary
Environmental Protection Agency
202-384-7510 (mobile)
Twitter: [@EPAPressOffice](#)

From: Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 27, 2021 10:51 AM
To: Carroll, Timothy <Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Media inquiry: PEER on EPA "hiding" VOC-exempt chemical's carcinogenicity

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Carroll, Timothy <Carroll.Timothy@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 27, 2021 10:07 AM
To: Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Media inquiry: PEER on EPA "hiding" VOC-exempt chemical's carcinogenicity

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Julia John <julia.john@chemicalwatch.com>
Sent: Monday, December 27, 2021 8:35 AM
To: EPA Press Office
Subject: Media inquiry: PEER on EPA "hiding" VOC-exempt chemical's carcinogenicity

Hi there,

I hope you had a nice holiday. I'm covering these new PEER claims, and I'd really appreciate getting the EPA's comment on them by 2 p.m. Eastern Time today. Here are my specific questions:

- 1) Overall, what's the agency's response to the accusations? How credible are they?
- 2) What, if any, mischaracterizations about the agency's efforts around PCBTF and its authorities do the PEER press release and complaint summary contain?
- 3) To what extent is the EPA actually promoting PCBTF?
- 4) According to the law, how is the agency supposed to deal with new chemicals including existing ones that pose risks? In PCBTF's case, how did the agency fulfill its legal duties?
- 5) How widespread and significant is this potential problem of the EPA not considering existing chemical risks within new chemical assessments? Are there any other specific examples of this?

Thanks so much,
Julia

Julia John

North America Reporter

+44(0)1743 818 101 (head office)

chemicalwatch.com



Follow us on



DISCLAIMER

This communication contains information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential and intended solely for the use of named addressees. If you are not a named addressee, you are notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this communication without the consent of the sender and that doing so is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender via return e-mail and delete it from your computer. Thank you. (v0)